



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,724	11/13/2003	David W. Freet	93214.036	2060
7590	11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
Paul F. Wille			FOX, CHARLES A	
6407 East Clinton Street				
Scottsdale, AZ 85254			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3652	
				DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/713,724	FREET ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Charles A. Fox	3652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 11-13,15,16,23,24,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11-13,15,16,23,24,26 and 27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 12, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The newly added limitation of at least said second telescoping member leads to confusion as to whether both have two nesting slides or only the second telescopic member. The limitations dealing with the structure of the nested slides can be read as belonging to either telescopic member. As dependent claims 12 and 23 clearly claims the channels on the first telescopic member this is how it is treated in the art rejection of claims 11 and 16 below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams et al. Williams et al. US 6,726,435 discloses a device for a vehicle comprising:
a lift with a first telescoping member(16), coupled to said vehicle within a protected area;
a second telescopic member (24) comprising at least two nested slides (52,54) attached to said first telescopic member;
a tool (12) comprising a platform coupled to said second telescopic member and movable along two orthogonal axes of motion defined by the telescopic members;
wherein both of the telescopic members has at least two nested slides;
wherein the first slide (28) has a pair of rollers (30) on each side and the second slide (14) has a pair of U-shaped channels for enclosing said rollers such that the slides provide telescopic action relative to a base member (36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12,13,23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. as applied to claims 11 and 16 above, and further in view of Walkden. Williams et al. teach the limitations of claims 11 and 16 as above, they do not teach any particular structure to the telescopic members. Walkden US 5,795,125 teaches a telescopic device comprising:

a first slide member (22) with rollers (70) thereon;
said rollers being mounted on each lateral side of said slide;
said slides also have a block (72) thereon for engaging a channel on a side opposite the rollers;

a second nested slide (24) said channels on opposite sides thereof;
said channels enclosing said rollers and blocks to provide a telescopic action;
wherein a block on either side of the slide is located between the two rollers on that respective side;

wherein said blocks stabilize the motion of the slide by biasing the carriage from side to side. While Walkden does not teach biasing the wheels relative to the blocks it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Williams et al. with a telescopic assembly as taught by

Walkden in order to allow the slides to move easily past one another while maintaining the alignment of said slides in all directions.

Claims 15,26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. as applied to claims 11 and 16 above, and further in view of Ringdahl et al. Williams teaches the limitations of claims 11 and 16 as above, they also teach drive motors for vertical and horizontal movement of the tool with an associated controller being inherent in the system. They do not explicitly teach any type of switch for their controller. Ringdahl et al. US 6,357,992 teaches a lift device for a wheel chair said device including a single switch (502) that initiates lifting and lowering of a platform (10) wherein the switch is connected to a microprocessor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention to provide the device taught by Williams et al. with a double throw switch and a microprocessor in order to control the device with a minimum of switches.

Response to Amendment

The amendments filed on October 12, 2006 have been entered into the record.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The location as limited by the claims places the structure of the nested slides on the first telescopic member mounted to the floor of the vehicle. The applicant alludes to them being on the second telescopic member, but this is not how the invention is claimed. As such the claims are hereby rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-6923. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00-4:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached at 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charles A. Fox 11-8-06
Charles A. Fox
Examiner
Art Unit 3652